

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/663,190	Applicant(s) OHKUBO ET AL.	
	Examiner Callie E. Shosho	Art Unit 1714	

All Participants:

(1) Callie E. Shosho.

(2) Cameron Kerrigan.

Date of Interview: 16 April 2007

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
 Rejection(s) discussed:

 Claims discussed:
 1, 8-9, 11, 22-23, 25-29

 Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.
 SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
 See Continuation Sheet

Part III.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability, Part II above.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner's amendment was agreed to and authorized by Mr. Kerrigan.

The amendments to each of claims 1, 11, 25, and 28 were made to ensure that the claims recite proper antecedent basis.

The amendments to each of claims 8 and 22 were made to correct minor grammatical and typing errors.

The amendment to each of claims 9, 23, 26, and 27 was made to clarify what "n" is and to make the recitation consistent with that found in other claims such as claim 7.

The amendment to claim 29 was made to avoid confusion with respect to what the colored particles comprise and to ensure that the claim language was consistent throughout the claim.